

1 MICHAEL W. BIEN – CA 096891  
2 ERNEST GALVAN – CA 196065  
3 KARA J. JANSSEN – CA 274762  
4 GINGER JACKSON-GLEICH – CA 324454  
5 ADRIENNE SPIEGEL - CA 330482  
6 LUMA KHABBAZ - CA 351492  
7 **ROSEN BIEN**  
8 **GALVAN & GRUNFELD LLP**  
9 101 Mission Street, Sixth Floor  
10 San Francisco, California 94105-1738  
11 Telephone: (415) 433-6830  
12 Email: mbien@rbgg.com  
13 egalvan@rbgg.com  
14 kjanssen@rbgg.com  
15 gjackson-gleich@rbgg.com  
aspiegel@rbgg.com  
lkhabbaz@rbgg.com

16 SUSAN M. BEATY – CA 324048  
17 **CALIFORNIA COLLABORATIVE FOR**  
18 **IMMIGRANT JUSTICE**  
19 1999 Harrison Street, Suite 1800  
20 Oakland, California 94612-4700  
21 Telephone: (510) 679-3674  
22 Email: susan@ccijustice.org

23 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

24 OREN NIMNI\* – MA 691821  
25 AMARIS MONTES\* – MD 2112150205  
26 **RIGHTS BEHIND BARS**  
27 416 Florida Avenue N.W. #26152  
28 Washington, D.C. 20001-0506  
Telephone: (202) 455-4399  
Email: oren@rightsbehindbars.org  
amaris@rightsbehindbars.org

29 STEPHEN S. CHA-KIM\* – NY 4979357  
30 **ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP**  
31 250 West 55th Street  
32 New York, New York 10019-9710  
33 Telephone: (212) 836-8000  
34 Email: stephen.cha-kim@arnoldporter.com

35 CARSON D. ANDERSON – CA 317308  
36 **ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP**  
37 3000 El Camino Real  
38 Five Palo Alto Square, Suite 500  
39 Palo Alto, California 94306-3807  
40 Telephone: (650) 319-4500  
41 Email: carson.anderson@arnoldporter.com

42 \* Admitted *pro hac vice*

43  
44  
45 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
46  
47 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, OAKLAND DIVISION**

48 CALIFORNIA COALITION FOR WOMEN  
49 PRISONERS et al.,

50 Plaintiffs,

51 v.

52 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
53 FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS et al.,

54 Defendants.

55 Case No. 4:23-cv-04155-YGR

56 **PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE**  
57 **MOTION PURSUANT TO CIVIL L.R. 7-**  
58 **11 FOR INCREASED ATTORNEY**  
59 **VISITATION BEFORE THE JANUARY 3**  
60 **EVIDENTIARY HEARING**

1 Pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-11, Plaintiffs respectfully move the Court for an emergency order  
 2 directing Defendants to allow for adequate visitation time with Plaintiffs' counsel so that they and  
 3 anticipated witnesses may have the opportunity to meaningfully prepare for the multiday Preliminary  
 4 Injunction Evidentiary Hearing scheduled to begin on January 3, 2024 ("Evidentiary Hearing").  
 5 Plaintiffs urgently seek relief from the Court because Defendants have rejected Plaintiffs' requests  
 6 for meaningful counsel access to the facility in the days leading up to the Evidentiary Hearing, instead  
 7 insisting that Plaintiff's counsel should be limited to only four hours of dedicated legal visitation time  
 8 on January 2—a patently unreasonable amount of time given that the hearing is anticipated to involve  
 9 dozens of witnesses. Moreover, Defendants have refused to provide substantive responses to serious  
 10 concerns raised by Plaintiffs' counsel that (1) FCI Dublin continues to fail to provide truly private  
 11 and confidential meeting spaces for counsel, contrary to Defendants' recent sworn submissions to the  
 12 Court; and (2) individuals and potential witnesses who have recently met with counsel since the Court  
 13 set the Evidentiary Hearing have been conspicuously and inexplicably targeted by strip searches, cell  
 14 searches and confiscation of legal papers, and suddenly announced transfers to other facilities.

15 Accordingly, Plaintiffs move for an Order requiring Defendants to provide Plaintiffs' counsel  
 16 adequate access to FCI Dublin, including its satellite prison camp, to meet privately and confidentially  
 17 with Plaintiffs and incarcerated witnesses in the days leading up to the Evidentiary Hearing as follows:  
 18 (1) for at least 4 hours each on December 31, 2023, and January 1, 2024, and (2) for the period of  
 19 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on January 2, 2024.

20 **I. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

21 As part of the parties' conferral about legal access to FCI Dublin in the days leading up to the  
 22 Evidentiary Hearing, on December 21, Plaintiffs' counsel requested the equivalent of two days' of  
 23 visits, asking for access on January 2, the day before the Evidentiary Hearing begins, and indicating  
 24 flexibility for additional access between December 30 and January 1. Declaration of Susan Beaty  
 25 ("Beaty Decl."), filed herewith, Ex. 1 at 1. This was consistent with Plaintiffs' counsel's earlier  
 26 request for access during this holiday weekend leading into the Evidentiary Hearing, to which the  
 27 Government still had not made a substantive response. Ex. 3. In response to Plaintiff's December  
 28 21 request, the FCI Dublin Executive Assistant informed Plaintiffs' counsel that legal visitation would

1 be provided only on January 2 between 9 a.m. and 1 p.m. Ex. 1 at 1. The Executive Assistant further  
 2 stated that Plaintiffs' counsel may otherwise enter FCI Dublin on December 30, December 31, and  
 3 January 1 as part of the general social visitation population, during which "the facility cannot  
 4 guarantee privacy/confidentiality." *Id.* (explaining social visitation processing occurs from 7:15 a.m.  
 5 to 9:30 a.m., 11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.).

6 In light of the fact that such conditions are insufficient to allow Plaintiffs to meaningfully  
 7 prepare given the number of witnesses involved, Plaintiffs' counsel thereafter contacted Government  
 8 counsel on December 28 requesting "access to the facility for legal visitation (1) for at least 4 hours  
 9 on December 31 and January 1, during a period that does not coincide with social visitation hours;  
 10 and (2) for the period of 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on January 2," explaining that Plaintiffs would seek  
 11 relief from the Court if this request could not be accommodated. *Id.*, Ex. 2 at 1-2.

12 Plaintiffs' counsel also re-requested a substantive response to concerns first raised on  
 13 December 19 and December 23 about incidents of retaliation against individuals speaking with  
 14 Plaintiffs' counsel that have occurred following the Court's determination that an Evidentiary Hearing  
 15 was necessary, specifically:

- 16 (1) prison staff have inexplicably begun strip-searching any incarcerated person who chooses  
     17 to meet with Plaintiffs' counsel—a practice that has never occurred in the seven years  
     18 members of Plaintiffs' legal team have been visiting FCI Dublin (with the exception of a  
     19 short period in March 2023 when the prison conducted such searches twice immediately  
     20 after BOP received a litigation demand letter from counsel)—leading to at least one  
     21 individual declining to participate in the visitation despite a desire to do so;
- 22 (2) one incarcerated person who met with counsel had her cell searched for over an hour,  
     23 despite not receiving any write-up, and found upon her return that her locker had been  
     24 opened and her legal paperwork, including copies of previous PREA grievances, had been  
     25 taken without documentation;
- 26 (3) just hours after a legal visit with Plaintiffs' counsel, three individuals, including two  
     27 identified to the Government as Plaintiffs' witnesses, were suddenly told that they would  
     28 be transferred, without warning and during the holidays.

1 *See id.* at 2-3. Plaintiffs' counsel additionally requested a substantive response to longstanding  
 2 concerns about lack of provision of private and confidential spaces during legal meetings. *See id.*  
 3 Plaintiffs' counsel accordingly requested that the Government provide "assurances that any  
 4 individual who wishes to participate in [legal] meetings will be able to do so without reprisal and in  
 5 a private and confidential manner." *Id.* at 2.

6 Later on December 28, the Government responded by refusing Plaintiffs request for two  
 7 business days' of legal access, suggesting that phone contact should otherwise suffice, despite  
 8 significant issues with the pilot legal phone program. *Id.* at 1<sup>1</sup>; Ex. 3 at 2 (explaining that, under the  
 9 pilot program, each dorm shares a single legal phone, those phones are only operational during certain  
 10 hours, and attorneys must disclose specific client names and often face long delays to have their  
 11 numbers approved). The Government also asserted in conclusory fashion that "there are no barriers  
 12 to adequate access," despite conceding that the "attorney pod" meeting spaces that the Government  
 13 had previously cited in its opposition to the motion for preliminary injunction as proof of adequate  
 14 legal access (see ECF No. 45-5 at 15, 24, ECF No. 46 at 12), were in fact "off line." *Id.*

## 15 **II. ARGUMENT**

16 Defendants should be ordered to afford Plaintiffs' counsel access to Plaintiffs and other  
 17 witnesses in the days leading up to the Evidentiary Hearing consistent with Plaintiffs' proposed  
 18 schedule of the equivalent of two business days. Given the sensitive nature of potential testimony,  
 19 and the aforementioned limitations of the pilot legal phone system, in-person visitation is necessary  
 20 to adequately prepare for the Evidentiary Hearing. Plaintiffs' proposal is also reasonable given the  
 21 needs of the Evidentiary Hearing and the number of witnesses that will be potentially involved, and  
 22 Defendants' refusal to accommodate this reasonable request is inconsistent with the Government's  
 23 own regulations and other guidelines.

24 Plaintiffs' counsel's only remaining opportunity for in-person access to prepare for the  
 25 Evidentiary Hearing are during *non-private, non-confidential* general social visitation hours on  
 26 December 30, December 31, and January 1, and one legal visitation block on January 2 from 9:00  
 27

---

28 <sup>1</sup> Because Defendants oppose Plaintiffs requested relief, no stipulation pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-12  
 could be obtained.

1 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. (during which private attorney pods will not be available). This is insufficient for  
 2 Plaintiffs to adequately prepare for the Evidentiary Hearing, which requires counsel to meet with a  
 3 large number of potential witnesses and to do so in person to make informed preparations in advance  
 4 of in-person testimony.<sup>2</sup>

5 Moreover, Defendants' insistence that they need only provide minimal, non-private access in  
 6 face of the particular, unique circumstances here—an Evidentiary Hearing set by the Court in a matter  
 7 of weeks—runs directly counter to the requirement that the Government “may not limit the frequency  
 8 of attorney visits since the number of visits necessary is dependent upon the nature and urgency of  
 9 the legal problems involved.” 28 C.F.R. § 543.13. Defendants' position similarly conflicts not only  
 10 with Department of Justice recommendations, which state that the Bureau of Prisons “should enhance  
 11 access to in-person legal visits,” especially in the context of “particularly important meetings,”  
 12 Advisory Group of DOJ Components, *Report and Recommendations Concerning Access to Counsel*  
 13 *at the Federal Bureau of Prisons' Pretrial Facilities* (2023) (“Access to Counsel Report”), available  
 14 at [https://www.justice.gov/d9/2023-07/2023.07.20\\_atj\\_bop\\_access\\_to\\_counsel\\_report.pdf](https://www.justice.gov/d9/2023-07/2023.07.20_atj_bop_access_to_counsel_report.pdf), at 3, 18,  
 15 but also FCI Dublin's own handbook, which stresses that attorney visits should be flexibly arranged  
 16 “based on the circumstances of each case,” FCI Dublin Inmate Admission & Orientation Handbook  
 17 (2023), available at [https://www.bop.gov/locations/institutions/dub/dub\\_ao-handbook.pdf?v=1.0.2](https://www.bop.gov/locations/institutions/dub/dub_ao-handbook.pdf?v=1.0.2),  
 18 at 32.

19 Undoubtedly, “impediments to legal visitation, including long wait times, inconsistent visiting  
 20 protocols, and lack of space to speak confidentially, can negatively impact the attorney-client  
 21 relationship and diminish the effectiveness of counsel.” Access to Counsel Report at 15. Recognizing  
 22 this fundamental principle, the BOP has acknowledged that “[t]he Warden shall provide the  
 23 opportunity for pretrial inmate-attorney visits on a seven-days-a-week basis” and that such visits  
 24

25

---

26 <sup>2</sup> To add to the complexity, the Government informed Plaintiffs on December 27 that it would be  
 27 calling five incarcerated individuals during the Evidentiary Hearing but declined to identify them  
 28 by name until December 29. Beaty Decl., ¶6. Plaintiffs' ability to respond to this development by  
 speaking with individuals at the prison would be significantly curtailed by the limited number of  
 hours of counsel access the Government proposes.

1 “may be conducted at times other than established visiting hours.” BOP Program Statement No.  
 2 7331.04, available at <https://www.bop.gov/policy/progstat/7331.05.pdf>, at 19.<sup>3</sup>

3 Accordingly, Plaintiffs respectfully request that they and their Evidentiary Hearing witnesses  
 4 be afforded private, confidential visitation with Plaintiffs’ counsel for at least 4 hours on December  
 5 31, 2023, and on January 1, 2024, and (2) for the period of 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on January 2, 2024.  
 6 This additional access for private, confidential attorney visitation is necessary given the significance  
 7 of the Evidentiary Hearing and is narrowly tailored because it requests only the minimum amount of  
 8 additional confidential in-person access necessary to adequately prepare for the Evidentiary Hearing.

9  
 10 Dated: December 28, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

11  
 12 By: /s/ Stephen Cha-Kim  
 13 Stephen Cha-Kim

14  
 15 **RIGHTS BEHIND BARS**  
 16 **CALIFORNIA COLLABORATIVE FOR**  
**IMMIGRANT JUSTICE**  
 17 **ROSEN BIEN GALVAN & GRUNFELD LLP**  
**ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP**

18  
 19 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28 <sup>3</sup> While these authorities specifically apply to incarcerated individuals awaiting criminal trials, there  
 is no discernable reason why these principles should not apply with equal force here.